

plementation. Much of the fault rests upon the shoulders of some appointed officials who do not see the need of an American Merchant Marine despite the lessons of both World Wars, the Korean conflict and our logistical problems in Viet Nam—to say nothing of our balance of payments problem. Certainly, our maritime industry, with the various segments selfishly at loggerheads with each other, is not without blame. Until there is strong and educated leadership guiding our maritime affairs, we shall drift from bad to worse.

There can be no question as to our need for a merchant fleet as an auxiliary for our armed services, whether the wars or emergencies are at home or abroad. The very officials who have contended otherwise are now seeking funds for the construction of some very controversial and expensive vessels, to be under their direct command, to do the job that our American Merchant Marine could have and can do far better at one-tenth the cost. This is the very unrealistic Fast Deployment Logistic ship program, FDL; more realistically FLDdLe-PaDdLe.

If we are to ship and receive goods and persons from overseas ports, we must have American-flag ships. We cannot depend upon any foreign flag to act as a wet nurse. The services which we may expect and the costs for those services are dependent upon our ability to serve ourselves. Without an American Merchant Marine we shall become sitting ducks, and will be plucked!

We are plagued by an increasing balance-of-payments problem. Every shipment of cargo in an American bottom works to our credit; in 1966 it was estimated that even our small fleet earned us \$914 million on the credit side. Just one shipment of about 9,000 tons from New Orleans to Bombay in a foreign ship debits us to the tune of about \$350,000.

We are not transporting anything like our share of our imports and exports, less than 8 per cent. The other 92 per cent travels in foreign-flag ships which are collecting the sizable revenue. Foreign-flag ships have engaged in our domestic commerce and have been sought to move our vital supplies to Viet Nam. All of these services cost us money which finds its way into foreign pockets.

Those of our public officials who have little regard for the need of an American Merchant Marine would have us build American ships in foreign shipyards, contending that such action would save us money. But every such ship so built would debit our balance of payments by about \$5 million. There are presently, under the regulations of our Maritime Administration, more than 100 subsidized ships which should be replaced due to their age. Foreign construction of those ships could worsen our balance of payments problem by about a half-billion dollars and, at the same time, nick the tax returns to our Treasury by untold millions. And still we would not be building up the size of our fleet, only replacing existing vessels by un-American ships.

We can salvage our American Merchant Marine within the framework of existing legislation provided all hands conform to the spirit and provisions of the Merchant Marine acts presently on the books. We need not scurry around and try to write new laws to regain our former status as first-class maritime power. We have a sound policy; all that is needed is a will to make it work.

PRODUCTION LINE SHIPS

First and foremost we need ships, many more of them and of all types. They must be American in all respects—by design, construction and operation. They should be built in production line programs, at least 25 to a course. They should be reasonably standardized with an absence of controversial features, dreamlike conceptions and avoiding the fetish of always increasing the installed horsepower, size and construction costs. By

adopting such a program, similar to the very successful C-2, Victory, Liberty and Mariner programs, we could cut our construction costs by at least 25 per cent, and we could soon have a fleet which we can, and must, support.

Our operating costs should, and must be, reduced even though this may be somewhat distasteful to the seagoing unions. Public support to seagoing featherbedding cannot long endure. The base wages and fringe benefits of seagoing labor are out-of-hand and must be reduced to the level of acceptable American practices. Just as examples, few of us expect an annual 75-day paid vacation nor do we expect to reap all of the rewards granted to others on a "me too" basis. If we make a contract, we live up to it and expect others to do the same.

With more ships, offering more job opportunities, the press for overmanning our existing ships would become unsupportable. Seagoing labor would do well to re-examine its position and take steps to fall in line with nation-wide practices. With sound leadership—government, management and labor—and without harm to any man, our operational costs may be made fair and reasonable.

SALVAGE MISSION

What would such a salvage mission for our shipwrecked American Merchant Marine cost? If we had an annual program of about 25 new vessels of moderate design and characteristics, reasonably standardized and built on a production line basis, it is probable that the construction-differential need not exceed \$110 million. This estimate does not contemplate the building of ships two or three of a class, promoting ships of untried design for questionable ventures, or the constant trend towards ships of greater speeds and sizes. Nor does it contemplate the retirement of existing ships, "obsolete" only because of their age.

What we require is more ships, seaworthy ships, ready and able to earn a part of their keep. Of the \$110 million appropriation, many of those dollars would return to our Treasury via our Internal Revenue Service. They would not drop into foreign pockets nor would they be wasteful expenditures.

Operating-differential subsidy is another and somewhat more complex matter. Our current requirements for far too few ships and sailings runs about \$200 million annually. This too-great cost is the result of the demands of the seagoing labor union leadership. They have been able to promote the gross over-manning of our declining numbers of ships, the payments of far-above-average base wages and fringe benefits mostly unknown to American Labor. Under the "fair and reasonable" provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, operational-differential subsidy payments could be reduced by about 25 per cent, but this only if management becomes aware that subsidy money will not be paid without public support. And if our Maritime Administration—without fear or favor and backed by the political party which put them in office—hews to the "fair and reasonable" provisions of that Act, insofar as the proper manning of a ship is concerned, that is the responsibility of our Coast Guard, not that of union bosses.

With an appropriation of less than a third of a billion dollars we can revitalize our essential American Merchant Marine and be back in business. Many of those appropriated dollars will return to our Treasury as revenue. One third of a billion dollars is not chicken feed despite our current lavish spending. But compared to the billions which we pour into Viet Nam, shoot at the moon and hand out to foreign nations, it is picayunish.

We would be building up our capital in our own resources, defense and commercial, to return us dividends. We surely will be damned if we don't and cannot be damned if we do.

But—and there always is a but—our merchantship service must be devoted to our national welfare and not be a grab bag for the

selfish interests of any segment of our maritime industry. Is that too much to expect? Maybe so, unless all hands mend their ways towards a maritime future as glorious as our past.

THE KENNEDY ROUND TALKS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, through every means of communications the American public was properly conditioned for the great benefits that would flow to humanity from the 1964-67 Kennedy round discussions dealing with foreign trade.

Prerenegotiation anticipation claims were abundant in every news item, and in every headline. During this 4-year period of table discussion with representatives from some 50 nations, many decisions were reached. In many of these decisions, though, it has become apparent that the several parties did not agree on the same item.

An example of this is the "good faith" expressed by the European participants not to raise the duty on imports—if we agreed to cut our countervailing duties back by 50 percent over a period of 5 years. Therefore, our first cutbacks have been made, but in the European Common Market we see an increase in duties of 11 cents per bushel for corn, and 9 cents per bushel for sorghum. These duties are used by the importing countries to support the price of the domestic production in most nations.

This variable import duty as of June 18, 1968, in the EEC nations amounts to \$1.50 per bushel on soft wheat, \$1.32 on corn, and 84 cents per bushel on barley. Present Minneapolis prices on No. 2 Yellow corn is \$1.09 per bushel.

If our American produced corn is sold here for \$1.09 per bushel, then shipped overseas and has a new price of \$2.35 a bushel to equal the support price in the EEC nations, American taxpayers are, in reality, paying for the subsidization of foreign farmers. Most of the subsidy is raised by various import duties.

Again, a case in point will clarify the above statement. The variable duty or levy in European Common Market nations on June 18, 1968, was \$55.13 per metric ton, while the guarantee to domestic producers of corn is set at \$52.62 a ton.

Mr. Speaker, serious doubts now exist on either the value of increasing the value of American farm exports, or of the authenticity of the agreements reached at the GATT Conference. Can we expect farmers to produce at any price to meet foreign domestic prices when these governments can vary their entrance price at any time and at any level? What future does the American farmer have?

Second, what reason do we have for believing that the surplus "levies" which they attach to our imports cannot be used to subsidize their exports to us? Uncle Sam ends up paying for both programs, both of which have the ability of doing ill to our own prices.

The eagerness of our friends in the EEC to raise, rather than lower, these duties does not indicate their willingness to "expand trade" or to move in the direction of "free trade" as we were led to believe would be the result of the Kennedy round.

With domestic producers experiencing low prices, and an unsympathetic administration, surely Congress should take some action to protect our own producers and suppliers.

HORTON NOTES DISMAY OVER CZECH INVASION EXPRESSED BY SOVIET PEOPLE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the terrible invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union has had repercussions around the world. It has even found its way through the Iron Curtain and resulted in doubts and reservations by the Soviet people themselves against the actions of their leaders.

James Critchlow, director of the information division of the Radio Liberty Committee has compiled an excellent review of the reactions of the Soviet people as gathered through several sources.

I would like to share this review with my colleagues. It provides an unusually objective report.

In a letter to me, Mr. Critchlow added some information about feelings of the Soviet students.

He said:

Since writing the review I have heard from a Russian-speaking visitor to Leningrad, who was there until September 1, that "all his acquaintances, including Communist students, reacted with great hostility to the occupation. One of these students, a Party member, added that the entire intelligentsia are against the Party decision and that workers as well support the intelligentsia. He further stated that complete disillusionment and anger against the Party are prevailing presently among the Party members. In talks on Czechoslovakia, students, including Party members, responded when the Party was discussed that they were impotent, as everything was decided by 'those idiots up there'."

The text of the Radio Liberty report on the Soviet reaction follows:

Memorandum to: Howland H. Sargeant, President, Radio Liberty Committee, Inc.
From: James Critchlow, Director of Information, RLC.
Subject: Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Public—A Review.

The full story of Soviet citizens' reaction to the Czechoslovak invasion may be long in unfolding, but significant patterns are already emerging from the telexes of our Munich analysts and other sources. Many Soviet citizens clearly have doubts and reservations about the move by their leadership, with some open dissent reported.

1. THE OFFICIAL VERSION

Anomalies in domestic propaganda during the crisis are revealing. The morning after the nighttime occupation, Radio Moscow's regular 6 a.m. (local time) review of the day's Soviet newspapers simply skipped all

mention of Czechoslovakia, even though "Pravda"—kept off the stands for four hours beyond usual delivery time—was set up with a major article in defense of the military action. (As of 8 a.m., the lead story of the day was still a report on Communist youth activities in a Ukrainian village.) Moscow's home service finally broke news of the invasion to citizens at 7:45 a.m. (a full two-and-a-half hours after Radio Liberty's first bulletin to Soviet audiences) with a TASS communique. The "text" of the purported request for Soviet help by nameless Czech officials did not come on the air until 4 p.m. But by then the CPSU's usual crisis machinery was functioning, with factories, farms and other units throughout the country halting work for "unanimous support" meetings. (Our researchers telexed from Munich that the main thrust of Soviet propaganda was to emphasize the "peaceful and reasonable" reception accorded to Soviet forces, in spite of the "counter-revolutionary underground" backed by Western imperialists.)

Meanwhile, internal sources carried little hard news of what was happening. Radio Moscow's evening newscast the day after the invasion stated rather lamely that "the Czechoslovak People's Army and formations of the People's Militia are not showing resistance to the Soviet troops" and TASS reported without detail that many Czechoslovaks had expressed gratitude.

As time went by without a break in the stalemate Moscow output became more candid (perhaps under pressure by competition from us and others), even mentioning such negative facts as the firing of Soviet tanks and the killing of Soviet soldiers and two journalists. Such incidents, however, were invariably ascribed to "anti-socialist forces."

For Soviets who followed their own media attentively, there was no lack of eyebrow-raising material. On the day (August 23) that "Pravda" frontpaged a TASS statement that the situation in Czechoslovakia "in general continues to remain normal," President Svoboda turned up inexplicably—in Moscow to discuss "problems of mutual interest." Intriguing is a circumstantial report from the respected Paris "Le Monde" that Soviet television tricked viewers by substituting footage of Svoboda filmed earlier at the Bratislava meeting—when he was smiling—for shots of his actual arrival in Moscow—when he was scowling. The Soviet public was also left in the dark on the whereabouts of Alexander Dubcek, denounced as a "traitor" and "leader of a right-opportunist minority" of the Czechoslovak leadership, until Dubcek re-emerged a few days later in Soviet press, radio and TV as "First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia" and participant in a "comradely discussion" just ended in the Kremlin. And his subsequent speech to his countrymen on return to Prague was reported in detail, if with some slanting. A quick rehabilitation!

Mass condemnation of the occupation which poured forth from such quarters as Yugoslavia and Rumania; the French, Italian and scores of other Communist and Left parties; and, among individuals, Bertrand Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre and Dr. Spock, as well as a host of other sources around the world, was of course beamed steadily to Soviet audiences by Radio Liberty and its fellow broadcasters. Soviet outlets were hard put to counter with approvals from abroad. Predictably, statements by the four Kremlin "allies" were played for all they were worth, as well as those from certain Arab countries. Otherwise, media were reduced to echoing such relatively faint voices as the Argentine CP organ "Nuestra Palabra" and the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica.

The list of major stories ignored completely, or distorted unrecognizably, is a long one. Near its head I would put the U.N. Security Council debate; it went on for days without notice from Soviet domestic media.

Even U.N. delegate Malik's speeches reached his fellow citizens only via "bourgeois" radio broadcasts—and through jamming, at that. (RL's U.N. correspondent, Germain Eykowsky, reported at length on Czech Foreign Minister Hajek's Security Council address, which was a masterful job of hoisting the Soviet leadership by its own Marxist-Leninist petard, tailor-made for Soviet audiences.)

2. SOVIET PUBLIC OPINION

One can only speculate about how much the Czech heresy had begun to infect Soviet public opinion before the Kremlin acted. Prior to the invasion our audience research reports from Max Ralis' staff contained positive (and often envious) references by Soviet citizens to the liberalizing trend. You will recall that a prominent Soviet literary figure who visited the West after Novotny's overthrow spoke of the great interest in developments, telling an interviewer last spring:

"Everything is known in Moscow. Everybody is glued to the radio. One can notice that the streets are empty and quiet. People are at home and listening."

This same man commented, however:

"Don't think that liberalization is so popular in our country. Among the intelligentsia in Moscow and Leningrad, undoubtedly. There exists, though, an enormous mass of officials, the new 'Soviet bourgeoisie' if you will, who are hostile to all change. They want only an apartment, or a car. You are disagreeably surprised by our newspapers, by the incessant propaganda and boredom? Eighty per cent of the writers would agree with you. Our newspapers, though, are not designed for them but for the 20 to 30 million 'bourgeoisie' who are the regime's mainstay."

(One wonders whether even the Soviet "bourgeoisie" hasn't been shaken by the specter of re-Stalinization which has emerged in recent weeks.)

The distress that Czechoslovakia must have been causing the leadership, on purely political grounds, is borne out by the fact that Academician Sakharov (the top Soviet nuclear physicist associated with H-Bomb development) praised developments there in his remarkable memorandum published in full by the "New York Times" on July 22.

The Soviet Republic bordering on Czechoslovakia is the Ukraine, where recent ferment has led to arrests and trials. It may be no accident that Politburo member Shelest, the Ukrainian Party Chief, is believed to be one of the most vocal supporters of action to stifle the Czech reformers.

Direct evidence of how Soviet citizens reacted to the invasion itself is fragmentary, but highly suggestive. A "New York Times" correspondent reported from Moscow that some people had "turned pale" on hearing the news. One extreme response was the demonstration by a group of dissident intellectuals (General Grigorenko, Pavel Litvinov, Mrs. Daniel, and a few others) who appeared with banners bearing such legends as "Long live a free and independent Czechoslovakia" and were promptly arrested. (One of the demonstrators, the poetess Natalya Gorbanevskaya, was later released together with her three-month-old baby; she circulated a signed letter ending with the words: "The belief that the Czechs and Slovaks, when thinking about the Soviet people, will think not only about the occupiers but also about us gives us strength and courage.") An American correspondent said he had heard reports of unrest among Moscow students (who during the Hungarian events of 1956, as we later learned, had been posting transcripts of foreign radio broadcasts on their bulletin boards). A Russian-speaking Canadian newsmen reported from Rostov-na-Donu in South Russia that people there were skeptical of official propaganda: one man commented, "My po-vidimomu prouchalis" ("We must have miscalculated.") In

Prague, a visiting Soviet scientist skeptically told a French journalist, "I'd like to know the names of these eminent persons who are supposed to have called on the Soviet army." Perhaps most significant of all is the fact that, with cold neo-Stalinist winds blowing, *no really major figure of the Soviet intelligentsia has lent his name* (as of this writing) to the "unanimous support" campaign mentioned above—a pointed omission and departure from standard practice. Most Muscovites bearded on the street by Western correspondents expressed unqualified support for their government's action, but whether from conviction or caution is open to doubt. No one can guess where the center of gravity of public opinion on the Czechoslovak question really lies, but the gingerly handling of the crisis in home media is a sign of official nervousness. Above all, there is the fact that on the night of the invasion VOA and BBC rejoined RL, after a five-year hiatus, as targets of Soviet jamming (which is, of course, only partially effective against powerful short-wave transmitters).

3. MORALE OF THE SOVIET OCCUPATION FORCES

Before departing for Czechoslovakia, each Soviet soldier was given a tract explaining his mission:

"Soviet soldier! You are going to fraternal Czechoslovak territory to perform your duty as an internationalist. The present situation in Czechoslovakia is such that counter-revolutionary forces, operating openly under the mask of 'democratization' and 'liberalization' of the existing order, are taking the country toward restoration of capitalism. This offensive by reaction is inspired and maintained by the imperialists, first and foremost those of the United States and the German Federal Republic . . .

"Soviet soldier! Perform your sacred internationalist duty, act with courage and determination against all who resist . . ."

Foreign correspondents reports from Czechoslovakia were rife with evidence of *disillusionment* by Soviet soldiers when they found that the "counter-revolutionaries" were the population itself, and saw their tanks being painted with red swastikas. Beneath the menacing posture, many were frightened and uneasy, others disgusted. Some soldiers were seen in tears. One Russian told a Czech that he would like to give up his uniform and walk away. The "Washington Post" correspondent heard that 400 KGB men had been sent in to keep things in hand, and that many of the original troops had been replaced with fresh contingents—possibly only a rumor. A "free" Czech station inside the country broadcast, in Russian, an eyewitness account (monitored in the West and rebroadcast to the USSR on tape by RL) of one Soviet soldier's suicide.

A Czech refugee gave four reasons for demoralization of the Soviet troops: (1) the unanimity of the population, (2) the fact that the Communist Party was directing the resistance, (3) the fact that the Czechs overwhelmingly supported their leaders and (4) the determination of the population for independence. He said a Soviet tank officer had told him of his astonishment at seeing Prague Communist militants come up to Soviet soldiers with their Party cards in hand, to explain the true state of affairs in the country. (Report carried by Agence France-Presse.)

Because the Czechoslovaks are fellow Slavs, many of them Russian-speaking, they seem to have reached the occupiers far better than did the Hungarians of 1956. Nor were all of the contacts low-level: a "Washington Post" Prague correspondent wrote that "the incipient dilution of fervor for the occupation is most acute among Soviet officers and

troops in close contact with their opposite members in the Czechoslovak Ministry of Defense and general staff, it was reported." (Is it merely wishful thinking to recall the "Decembrists," the 19th Century band of anti-tsarist Russian officers infected with Western heresies by their exposure abroad during the Napoleonic wars?)

4. THE OUTLOOK

Many experts have speculated that Soviet dithering before the final decision to invade betrayed a lack of unity in the Politburo itself—as shown by the fact that the full complement of that body had to travel to Cierna for negotiations. The initial failure of the occupation, with all its attendant embarrassments at home and abroad, must have lent ammunition to Soviet "doves." Add to this the pressures from the Sakharovs, the Solzhenitsyns, and other dissident intellectuals, together with the host of unsolved economic and social problems that affect all levels of the population, and the position of the leadership can only be less than secure. *Short-term prospects for Czech (and Soviet) liberals are grim; for the long run there are signs of hope.*

Throughout all of these events, Radio Liberty in its round-the-clock broadcasts has continued to act as a catalyst in Soviet ferment. Never has its unique role as a voice of Soviet citizens abroad been more evident. As Moscow propaganda tuned up to the invasion, our London commentator Zaitsev (a veteran Soviet journalist who defected recently) was on hand with an insider's interpretation for listeners. Former Soviet Navy officer Kartashev spoke from first-hand knowledge of military morale problems. Temirov, onetime instructor at the Moscow Institute of Red Professors, covered the party-member's angle. (I hope it isn't unfair to single out these few from the many staffers who turned to with commentaries, news items, analyses, press reviews and other material. And, of course, Radio Liberty must share credit with other broadcasters: in particular a yeoman job was done by Voice of America, whose regular staff tripled its programming output during the peak of the crisis.)

JUIC CRITCHLOW.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 30, 1968.

PSYCHOLOGISTS FOR SOCIAL INVOLVEMENT

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, an organization of 20 psychologists who call themselves distinguished, recently circularized many of their colleagues around the Nation urging unqualified endorsement of the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The petition appealed to all psychologists to rubber-stamp this committee's determination that "recent disorders result largely from conditions of discrimination, poverty and unemployment which have their roots in racial prejudice." One of those who was solicited with this petition was Dr. T. William Howard, Ph.D., Consulting Psychologist of Springfield, Mo., and a diplomat, American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology. Dr. Howard considers the request of the Psychologists for Social Involvement biased and unscientific, to say the least. Because his answer is so pertinent to many of the issues that confront our Nation today, I

submit a copy of the petition of Psychologists for Social Involvement, followed by the response from Dr. Howard for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1968.

DEAR APA MEMBER: Twenty distinguished psychologists have endorsed the following statement:

As psychologists we are particularly concerned with the influences of environment upon behavior. We endorse the conclusion of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders that the recent disorders result largely from conditions of discrimination, poverty, and unemployment, which have their roots in racial prejudice. As citizens, we strongly urge that direct action be taken to combat these unjust conditions. Concrete evidence of changing conditions, rather than vague hopes for the future, must be apparent without delay in order to avoid the death and destruction that is incipient in our nation.

Nancy Bayley, Leonard Berkowitz, Leon Festinger, Eleanor J. Gibson, James J. Gibson, David A. Grant, Harry Helson, Ernest R. Hilgard, Nicholas Hobbs, James Jenkins, David Krech, Donald G. Marquis, Abraham Maslow, Paul E. Meehl, Neal Miller, Theodore Newcomb, James Olds, Thomas Pettigrew, Carl R. Rogers, Theodore Sarbin.

We are writing to ask that you join these psychologists by endorsing this statement. The statement, endorsed by thousands of psychologists, will be presented to the President, Members of Congress, the platform committees of the major parties, and the various news media. (We hope that your signature will be only a first step and that you will at this time write to your Congressman and become actively involved in community efforts.)

Signature _____
Name (Please Print) _____
State of Residence _____

We would also appreciate your help with the following:

1. Our limited funds have permitted this mailing only to APA members whose names begin with letters A through K. We urge you to ask your friends and acquaintances with names beginning with L through Z to send us a letter or postcard endorsing the statement to the address below. Endorsements by graduate students and psychologists who are not APA members are welcomed.

2. Check here ---- if you would have preferred a stronger statement.

3. A small donation (\$1.00 or less) would help defray the cost of this mailing and enable us to expand our effort.

Please return this form with your signature as soon as possible to: Psychologists for Social Involvement, P.O. Box 31283, San Francisco, California 94131.

ROBERT E. HARRIS, Ph.D.,

Coordinator.

L. ALAN SROUFE, Ph.D.

Secretary-Treasurer.

AUGUST 2, 1968.

Dr. ROBERT E. HARRIS,
Coordinator, Psychologists for Social Involvement, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR DR. HARRIS: Thank you for letting me see your statement. In many ways I am in sympathy with it. Certainly I would like to "avoid the death and destruction that is incipient in our nation." But I have some questions.

In the first place, does your statement imply that the "civil disorders" are justified by the "discrimination, poverty, and unemployment . . ."? Are civil disorders a response to some "higher duty" that excuses, or even demands, violations of the law? Are the rioters people who "just can't help" burning down buildings, endangering lives? Should the police take immediate and "direct" ac-

¹ Full text published in "Le Monde" of August 27. A copy of the tract was obtained by a Yugoslav visitor to Brno.

E 8308

tion to suppress violations of the law, or should they "discuss the matter with leaders" as they did in Watts and Detroit? What "direct" action do you advocate for arsonists?

With regard to "environmental influences," is not your statement an environmental influence? Is not the "negotiating" and "granting demands" of those in violation of the law a reward of aggression? Does not reward increase aggression?

Do you really think that these "civil disorders" are "largely" the result of "discrimination, poverty, and unemployment"? Were those arrested last summer and this spring impoverished and unemployed? Am I mistaken in thinking that history records no nation so concerned about its downtrodden as is America today? Do not welfare programs proliferate and federal training programs spring like weeds? And do revolutions really spring from the "downtrodden"?

I am afraid something of the "white man's burden" is implied by your statement. Equality of opportunity is actually increasing, and non-discrimination is "the law of the land." With more equal opportunities I believe the Negro can deliver himself; he does not need—and he will probably resent the implication that he does—the help of "Masses" of any hue (even the distinguished psychologist variety).

Civil disorders weaken the law. It is romantic, isn't it to hope for prosperity where distinguished men imply endorsement of violations of the very law that sustains us?

I hope that the "distinguished psychologists" favoring your statement will consider some of these questions. At the very least, I hope you will not imply your position is "scientific." I hope you will agree that it is an emotional exhortation, and the passion does not lead to the considered judgments required by science. Improving the condition of the poor can be justified on humanitarian grounds; you do not need to pretend "science" endorses you—and while you may need to use exhortation, you do not need half-truths, extortion, and blackmail (i.e. "If we don't do it they'll burn us out.")

Yours sincerely,

T. WILLIAM HOWARD, Ph.D.
Clinical Psychologist.

P.S.—As you ask, I will send copies of this reply to my senators and congressman.

TWH.

A MATTER OF RESPONSIBILITY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have 87 outstanding weekly newspapers in my Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota. Most of them are very independently minded, and follow an editorial policy of "telling it like it is."

I am thankful for these outspoken ladies and gentlemen of the press, for their opinions, and for the thinking their editorials generate in the minds of our people.

Typical of this editorial expression is the following which appeared in the Renville Star-Farmer of September 12, which I would like to share with my honorable colleagues here in Congress:

A MATTER OF RESPONSIBILITY

We are living in an era in which the federal government has become all powerful, particularly in supplying funds to help states and cities to conduct numerous programs of

social welfare—housing, unemployables, and even rodent infestation.

One of the reasons why there will be less heard of government plans to rebuild American cities, wipe out poverty and find jobs for the unemployed may be found in the record of government efforts in these directions in the past seven years.

According to figures published in the very factual U.S. News & World Report recently, after seven years of striving, the government has achieved little other than to run up huge bills and expand an already gigantic bureaucracy. During this time, the federal debt has risen by \$63 billion, the value of the dollar has declined 13.5 cents, taxes on incomes of individuals have gone up by \$30 billion and on corporations by \$10 billion. The civilian bureaucracy has increased during that seven years by 421,000 new jobs—that's a lot of vote power for the incumbent administration. It will take your vote, my vote and the vote of every aroused American to off-set that padding and inaugurate a new management which is at least dedicated to states rights and the free enterprise of the individual.

An interesting bit of tabulation was recently released by the National Association of Manufacturers: "Your IOU for the United States public debt is getting bigger. Each American at the end of May owed \$81 more as his share of the nation's debt than he did on the same day (May 31) in 1967. This sum, according to the Tax Foundation, Inc., represents the difference between the per capita U.S. debt on May 31, 1967 (\$1,876) and on May 31, 1968 (\$1,767). On May 31 of this year, the total U.S. debt was \$353 billion, \$21 billion higher than on the same day in 1967. This is one more reason why it is necessary to cut federal spending now!"

My, that gesture which President Johnson consented to of \$6.5 billion cut in federal spending in return for passing the new income tax surtax is really impressive, isn't it?

In spite of the great portion of this national debt used to alleviate the domestic social ills, big city problems have grown steadily worse, respect for law and order has grown more steadily inadequate, and too many colleges have become centers of socialistic and communistic-inspired rioting rather than seats of learning. If nothing else, the past seven years have shown the futility of looking to government as the chief architect of progress—it's time to return administration of economic and industrial progress to the system of free enterprise.

If we haven't the united front to contest a rising tax program, the least we can do is to take some action regarding the ways in which our money is spent . . . the horrible known stories of senseless waste in federal spending are legendary, including many ridiculous expenditures in the \$152 billion in foreign aid down to the \$210 doorknobs for the Pentagon.

If we haven't written the people who control federal spending—our Congressmen (Congressman John Zwach has a commendable record of attempting to stem the avalanche of spending), our Senators and the President of the United States, lately—perhaps it's time we got at it, and we can also effectively register our protest at the polling stations this coming November 5.

THE "PUEBLO"—HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 247th day the U.S.S. Pueblo and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT RECOMMENDS CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as Congress approaches adjournment, it is appropriate and fitting to emphasize that the House has taken an important and constructive action in adopting the official rules of conduct recommended by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Certainly the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], and members of the committee are to be commended for their dedication, perseverance and courage in recommending a strong, reasoned code of conduct.

It is my belief that this code will prevent the tearing down of the institution of Congress and will add to the stature and prestige of our legislative branch of Government.

In this connection I place my recent newsletter, "Capitol Comments," in the Record because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter.

The newsletter follows:

[From Capitol Comments by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee]

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT RECOMMENDS CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

A code of standards for guiding and governing the ethical conduct of Members of the House of Representatives, officers and employees was recommended by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. This Select Committee of 12 members was appointed by the Speaker after the House in a resolution called for the preparation of a comprehensive code of ethics for Members of the House. Your Representative was honored to be among those chosen and selected from the entire membership of the House to serve on the Committee and to draft the code of standards for Members of Congress.

Following extensive public hearings, studies and discussions, the Committee prepared its report which includes a number of recommended standards including a retirement for disclosure of personal interests in businesses which engage in substantial transactions with the Federal Government or which are subject to regulation by agencies of the Federal Government. In addition to the requirement for public disclosure and bars against conflict of interest, Members, officers and employees of the House—under terms of the code—will be required to comply with the following standards:

I. A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall conduct himself at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House of Representatives.

II. A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall adhere to the spirit and the letter of Rules of the House and to the rules of duly constituted committees thereof.

III. A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall receive no compensation nor shall he permit any compensation to accrue to his beneficial interest from any source, the receipt of which would occur by virtue of influence improperly ex-